arXiv:1508.04081v2 [hep-ph] 18 Aug 2015

DPF2015-192
August 17, 2015

Improving parton distribution uncertainties in a W mass measurement at the LHC

Zack Sullivan[1]

Department of Physics
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, Illinois 60616-3793, USA

Seth Quackenbush

Physics Department
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4350, USA

We reexamine the dominant contribution of parton distribution function (PDF) uncertainties to the W mass measurement, and determine their contribution is ±39(30) MeV when running the Large Hadron Collider at 7(13) TeV. We find that spurious correlations in older PDF sets led to over-optimistic assumptions regarding normalization to Z observables. In order to understand the origin of the large uncertainties we break down the contribution of the PDF errors into effects at the hard matrix element level, in showering, and in sensitivity to finite detector resolutions.

Using CT10, CT10W, and charm enhanced PDF sets in comparison to older PDF sets, we develop a robust analysis that examines correlations between transverse mass reconstructions of W and Z decays (scaled by $\cos\theta_W$) to leptons. We find that central leptons ($|\eta_l| < 1.3$) from W and Z bosons carry the most weight in reducing the PDF uncertainty, and estimate a PDF error of $^{+10}_{-12}$ MeV is achievable in a W mass measurement at the LHC. Further reductions of the W mass uncertainty will require improved fits to the parton distribution functions.

PRESENTED AT

DPF 2015
The Meeting of the American Physical Society
Division of Particles and Fields
Ann Arbor, Michigan, August 4–8, 2015

---

[1] Presenting author. zack.sullivan@iit.edu

1 Introduction

While the mass of the W boson is currently known to an astonishing two parts in ten thousand, the uncertainty is dominated by the theoretical estimate of parton distribution function (PDF) errors. The combined efforts of the CDF and D0 collaborations at the Fermilab Tevatron have established $M_W = 80.385 \pm 15$ GeV [1]. Despite this accomplishment, the recent discovery of a Higgs-like boson [2, 3] shows the most sensitive constraint on consistency of the Standard Model global fit [4] is the W mass uncertainty. In addition, most models of enhanced symmetry predict significant quantum corrections to the W mass, e.g., supersymmetry can shift the mass by 2–20 MeV [5, 6], hence a measurement of the mass to 5 MeV or better at the LHC is desirable [6].

In a recently published article [7], we demonstrate that current PDF uncertainties would lead to a ±39(30) MeV error in a LHC measurement at 7(13) TeV. However, we propose a new technique to reduce that uncertainty to ±10–12 MeV or better that is robust against spurious correlations that plague earlier theoretical error estimates. Hence, with improvements to individual PDF uncertainties in combination with our method, a 5 MeV measurement of M_W should be achievable using data from the LHC.

2 PDF contribution to the M_W uncertainty

The W mass is measured by fitting templates to leptonic observables from W boson decay to $e\nu_e$ or $\mu\nu_\mu$. The most reliably predicted observable is the transverse mass variable

$$M_T = \sqrt{2p_T^l E_T^{\text{miss}}(1 - \cos(\Delta\phi_{l,\text{miss}}))}. \tag{1}$$

While predictions by RESBOS [8, 9] and measurements [10] of lepton transverse momentum P_T^l or missing energy E_T^{miss} are individually good, they are both subject to errors in the estimate of W boson recoil from soft QCD radiation. These errors are suppressed in M_T. In addition, PDF errors turn out to be significantly larger for p_T^l and E_T^{miss} alone. Hence, we concentrate on M_T below.

The first key observation of Ref. [7] is that PDF errors enter in multiple places into the prediction of the W mass templates. Hard matrix-element calculations show that PDFs shift the rapidity distribution of the W boson, causing acceptance uncertainties in the fits. We find a larger uncertainty arises from soft QCD initial state radiation. This latter effect probes a higher-x, lower-Q^2 region of the PDFs than the matrix element — a more poorly constrained region. Finally, the M_T calculation is afflicted by small additional shifts caused by finite detector resolution providing access to a broader, less well-constrained region of the PDFs. This decomposition is critical, as it points to where progress can be made in improving PDF uncertainties.

Older estimates of PDF uncertainties at the LHC were large, ±25 MeV [11, 12], though recent predictions that missed some of the effects above claim that they are under control at the ±10 MeV level [13–15]. All other theoretical and experimental errors are expected to be small [6], and so we concentrate on updating the PDF errors using modern CTEQ CT10 and CT10W [16] PDFs. We find the uncertainties in Table 1 are significantly larger than previously estimated. The increase in error is predominantly due to the removal of a restriction on the form of the s quark PDF in newer PDF sets that was causing spurious correlations in the error estimates. Another large uncertainty arises due to u/d valence discrepancies in the forward detector region at the Tevatron that led to the need for separate CT10 and CT10W fits. The 10 MeV difference between the error estimates should be taken as an unknown systematic in the PDF fits that will be improved resolved with data from the LHC. Finally, we point out that the charm PDF is still somewhat restricted in form in the conventional PDF fits, and we estimate[*] that up to an additional 10 MeV uncertainty can arise in more flexible charm fits.

	7 TeV			13 TeV		
	CT10	CT10W	CT10+IC	CT10	CT10W	CT10+IC
m_T error	$^{+39}_{-39}$	$^{+27}_{-27}$	$^{+39}_{-40}$	$^{+30}_{-27}$	$^{+25}_{-24}$	$^{+30}_{-31}$
p_T^e error	$^{+59}_{-54}$	$^{+46}_{-45}$	$^{+59}_{-65}$	$^{+54}_{-52}$	$^{+48}_{-50}$	$^{+54}_{-65}$

Table 1: Updated uncertainties in MeV at the LHC from various CTEQ PDFs for M_T and P_T^l measurements. IC estimates an additional unknown charm quark contribution to the PDF error normally left out of the standard Hessian calculation.

3 A robust method for improving PDF errors

Two types of *in situ* experimental handles exist to improve the PDF uncertainty contribution to the W mass measurement. The first handle is the separation of W events into four categories: W^+ vs. W^-, and central $|\eta_l| < 1.3$ vs. forward $|\eta_l| > 1.6$ charged leptons. Attempts to further partition charged lepton pseudorapidity are marginally effective: valence quark PDF uncertainties are mostly concentrated in forward events, while sea quark PDF uncertainties dominate the central region. Careful account of correlations between these four regions allows for a reduction in the PDF uncertainty in the M_T measurement to ±20 MeV — an improvement, but not enough.

The most important improvement to the PDF uncertainties comes in reducing the PDF contribution to initial state radiation uncertainties by normalizing the W

---

[*] Our estimate uses the CTEQ 6.6C2 [17] intrinsic charm PDF to bound the error.

mass measurement to a measurement of the Z mass, as first suggested in Ref. [18]. We update this idea by recommending the Z mass be split into four subsamples: $Z^{\pm}$ represents applying identical cuts to the charged lepton from the Z decay that matches the $W^{\pm}$ central or forward boson sample, and basic acceptance cuts are applied to the other lepton. We then recommend a linear fit to a weighted sum

$$\sum_{i \in W,Z} \alpha_i M_W^i, \tag{2}$$

where $M_W^Z = \cos\theta_W M_Z$, and the α_i are determined by minimizing the 8x8 correlation matrix formed from W and Z measurements. For derivations and detailed correlation matrices see Ref. [7].

It is important to note that older predictions that attempted to normalize to the Z measurements suffer from the same false correlations that afflicted the total PDF error prediction. E.g., correlations that were 85% before are found to be closer to 40% in modern PDFs. The relevant PDFs are now fairly stable, and so we do not expect significant further degradation in the correlations. We confirm this with our modeling of extreme charm uncertainties.

After minimization we find consistent predictions for the PDF contribution to the W mass uncertainty shown in Table 2. Even after the addition of possible charm uncertainties, a robust uncertainty of ±10–12 MeV can be achieved. A similar treatment of p_T^l uncertainties estimates a robust ±18 MeV uncertainty can be achieved in that channel.

M_T^W	CT10	CT10W	CT10+IC	CT10+IC$_{\text{opt}}$
7 TeV	$^{+11}_{-10}$	$^{+8}_{-8}$	$^{+11}_{-20}$	$^{+13}_{-12}$
13 TeV	$^{+10}_{-11}$	$^{+7}_{-11}$	$^{+10}_{-14}$	$^{+10}_{-12}$

Table 2: Robust uncertainties in MeV possible at the LHC using the proposed cuts and normalization to Z data in a M_T measurement. IC estimates greatly reduced charm quark contributions to the PDF errors normally left out of the standard Hessian error calculation, and can be optimized away.

4 Conclusions

The dominant uncertainty in the experimental measurement of the W boson mass is the theoretical contribution of PDF errors. We isolate the origins of these contributions and find PDFs enter the error estimates in three places: at the matrix element level (probing medium-x, medium Q^2 PDFs), in the initial state QCD radiation (probing large-xz, small-Q^2 PDFs), and again when detector effects shift the sensitivity to different PDF regions.

We find that spurious correlations in older PDFs and matrix-element level analyses led to overoptimistic predictions for PDF uncertainties in LHC measurements. However, we introduce a robust method that uses kinematic features of the data and a correlated relationship to Z initial-state radiation to propose a method that can reach ±10–12 MeV in a M_T measurement using CT10 PDFs. With small improvements to overall PDF fit uncertainties, particularly using forward u/d data from LHC, we are confident that our method can reach the desired 5 MeV level of uncertainty and form a rigorous test of physics beyond the standard model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Award Nos. DE-SC0008347 and DE-FG02-13ER41942.

References

[1] T. A. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF and D0 Collaborations], Phys. Rev. D **88**, 052018 (2013) [arXiv:1307.7627 [hep-ex]].

[2] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].

[3] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].

[4] K. A. Olive *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Chin. Phys. C **38**, 090001 (2014).

[5] S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, D. Stockinger, A. M. Weber, and G. Weiglein, J. High Energy Phys. **0608**, 052 (2006) [hep-ph/0604147].

[6] M. Baak *et al.*, in *Planning the Future of U.S. Particle Physics: Report of the 2013 Community Summer Study of the APS Division of Particles and Fields*, edited by Norman A. Graf, Michael E. Peskin, and Jonathan L. Rosner, eConf C1307292, EF19 (2014) [arXiv:1310.6708 [hep-ph]].

[7] S. Quackenbush and Z. Sullivan, accepted for publication in Phys. Rev. D (2015) [arXiv:1502.04671 [hep-ph]].

[8] G. A. Ladinsky and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 4239 (1994) [hep-ph/9311341].

[9] F. Landry, R. Brock, P. M. Nadolsky, and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 073016 (2003) [hep-ph/0212159].

[10] T. A. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **89**, 072003 (2014) [arXiv:1311.0894 [hep-ex]].

[11] V. Buge, C. Jung, G. Quast, A. Ghezzi, M. Malberti, and T. Tabarelli de Fatis, J. Phys. G **34**, N193 (2007).

[12] N. Besson *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **57**, 627 (2008) [arXiv:0805.2093 [hep-ex]].

[13] G. Bozzi, J. Rojo, and A. Vicini, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 113008 (2011) [arXiv:1104.2056 [hep-ph]].

[14] J. Rojo and A. Vicini, arXiv:1309.1311 [hep-ph].

[15] G. Bozzi, L. Citelli, and A. Vicini, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 113005 (2015) [arXiv:1501.05587 [hep-ph]].

[16] H. L. Lai, M. Guzzi, J. Huston, Z. Li, P. M. Nadolsky, J. Pumplin, and C.-P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 074024 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2241 [hep-ph]].

[17] P. M. Nadolsky, H. L. Lai, Q. H. Cao, J. Huston, J. Pumplin, D. Stump, W. K. Tung, and C.-P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 013004 (2008) [arXiv:0802.0007 [hep-ph]].

[18] W. T. Giele and S. Keller, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 4433 (1998) [hep-ph/9704419].